Edward W. Swanson SBN 159859 1 SWANSON, McNAMARA & HALLER LLP 300 Montgomery Street, Suite 1100 San Francisco, California 94104 3 Telephone: (415) 477-3800 Facsimile: (415) 477-9010 4 Attorney for Petitioner Dung The Pham 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 **DUNG THE PHAM** C 02-1348 PJH 12 Petitioner, STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXTENDING TIME TO 13 CONDUCT ANALYSIS OF VS. **GUNSHOT RESIDUE SAMPLES** 14 C.A. TERHUNE, 15 Respondent. 16 **STIPULATION** 17 Petitioner Dung The Pham, by and through his counsel Edward W. Swanson, and 18 Respondent, by and through his counsel Deputy Attorney General Glenn R. Pruden, hereby agree 19 and stipulate as follows: 20 1. On July 17, 2006, the Court ordered the State to provide gunshot residue samples 21 to Petitioner within 30 days and Petitioner to have the samples analyzed within 60 days. See 22 Docket No. 72. 23 2. Due to difficulties in retrieving the samples from custody of the California 24 Superior Court for the County of Santa Clara, Petitioner's expert will not receive the samples 25 until September 13, 2006, only two (2) days before the Court's deadline for completing the 26 analysis. 27 3. Petitioner's expert has informed Petitioner's counsel that it will take two (2) 28

weeks from the time the samples are received to complete the analysis of the samples.

- 4. In light of the foregoing, the parties request that the time for completing Petitioner's analysis of the samples be extended by 14 days, to September 29, 2006.
- 5. The parties further request that the remaining deadlines under the Court's Order of July 17, 2006, remain unchanged, to wit: Petitioner will provide the State with raw data and laboratory notes, and will inform the Court in writing that testing has been completed, within 10 days of test completion; Petitioner will file a supplemental brief within 30 days of test completion; the State will file its opposition no later than 30 days after Petitioner's brief is filed; and Petitioner will file a reply no later than 7 days after the State's opposition is filed.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

1112

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Dated: September 12, 2006

Dated: September 12, 2006

9/14/06

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

Dated:

2324

25

26

27

28

STIP. AND [PROPOSED] ORDER RE: GSR ANALYSIS Pham v. Terhune, Case No. C 02-1348 PJH

 $/_{\rm S}/$

Edward W. Swanson Swanson, McNamara & Haller LLP

Attorneys for DUNG THE PHAM

/5

Glenn R. Pruden Deputy Attorney General Attorney for Respondent

ORDER

2

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

The Honorable I United States Di

IT IS SO ORDERED

Less Di

Judge Phyllis J. Hamilton

DISTR